

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the current application. Claims 1-31 are pending. No claims have been amended. The following arguments are provided to impart precision to the claims, by more particularly pointing out the invention, rather than to avoid prior art.

Double Patenting Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4-27, and 29-30 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2, 4-5, 10, and 16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,711,565 filed by Applicants. A terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §1.321(c) is enclosed with this response to overcome the double patenting rejection. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Examiner rejected claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,014,662 (hereinafter “Moran”) in view of U.S. Patent 6,292,802 (hereinafter, “Kessenich”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Specifically, claim 1 includes the limitation, or a limitation similar thereto, of:  
receiving search criteria entered by a user, wherein the search criteria includes at least one **search keyword**;  
searching a database for data records matching the search criteria;  
generating search results comprising of the data records matching the received search criteria; and  
caching the search results to maintain persistency of the search results.  
(Applicants’ Independent Claim 1).

The Examiner admitted in the Office Action that Moran fails to disclose search criteria including at least one search keyword (Office Action, p.7, lines 10-12). However, the Examiner argued that Kessenich discloses keyword searching. The Examiner further argued that, given the intended broad application of Moran's system, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicants' invention to modify the teachings of Moran with the teachings of Kessenich to include keyword searching as it is the most popular and the most well known search for database mining (Office Action, p.7, lines 12-18). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's argument.

It is respectfully submitted that it would not have been obvious to modify the system in Moran to include receiving search criteria having at least one search keyword because Moran explicitly teaches against such modification. According to Moran, text searching systems, which are based on searching for particular words, are difficult to use because it is difficult to formulate a precise search query (Moran, col. 1, lines 28-36). Moran further disclosed that the results generated by many text searching systems are unsatisfactory because such results are either overwhelming or incomplete (Moran, col. 1, lines 36-43). Therefore, the system proposed by Moran does not receive search criteria including at least one search keyword (Moran, col. 6, lines 31-33). Since Moran explicitly teaches against modifying their system to include receiving search criteria having at least one search keyword, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the system in Moran with receiving search criteria having at least one search keyword. For at least this reason, claim 1 is not obvious over Moran in view of Kessenich. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

For at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1, claims 10, 16, 21, and 27 are patentable over Moran in view of Kessenich. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 2-9, 11-15, 17-20, 22-26, and 28-31 depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 10, 16, 21, and 27. Therefore, claims 2-9, 11-15, 17-20, 22-26, and 28-31 are patentable over Moran in view of Kessenich for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Furthermore, claims 3, 18, 23, and 31 are patentable over Moran in view of Kessenich for at least the following reason. Claims 3, 18, 23, and 31 sets forth the limitation, or a limitation similar thereto, of refining the search results **based on at least one result refining keyword** entered by the user. Neither Moran nor Kessenich discloses such a limitation. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Moran teaches against the use of keyword to search. As to Kessenich, it merely discloses invoking *linear search technique* within standard web browsers to refine the search of the information returned (Kessenich, col. 13, lines 29-33). Therefore, even if the disclosures of Moran and Kessenich are combined, the combination still lacks at least the above limitation. It is respectfully submitted that claims 3, 18, 23, and 31 are patentable over Moran in view of Kessenich for at least this reason. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call C. Teresa Wong at (408) 720-8300, x377.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: June 4, 2004

*C7*  
Chui-kiu Teresa Wong  
Reg. No. 48,042

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300